Protestant Worship Music: A Theological Critique of Blasphemy, Pagan Syncretism, and Self-Centered Idolatry

Protestantske Lofsang: In Teologyske Krityk op Godslasterjen, Heidenske Synkretisme, en Selsrjochte Ôfgoaderij

新教敬拜音樂：對褻瀆神明、異教融合主義與自我中心偶像崇拜之神學批判

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευϊτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

I. Introduction / Ynlieding / 導論

The music of the Protestant church has, in recent decades, become one of the most contentious and theologically consequential battlegrounds in Christendom. Far from a mere aesthetic debate over organ versus electric guitar, the controversy surrounding Contemporary Praise and Worship (CPW) music strikes at the heart of what it means to worship the God of Scripture—and whether much of what passes for "worship" in Protestant congregations today constitutes, in theological reality, a form of blasphemy. This essay advances three interconnected theses: first, that a significant proportion of Protestant worship music borrows its melodic, harmonic, and structural foundations from New Age and pagan musical traditions, and that merely superimposing

"Christian-sounding" lyrics onto such foundations does not sanctify what is fundamentally pagan in origin; second, that the lyrical content of much Protestant worship music is anthropocentric rather than theocentric—centering on the individual self ("how Jesus loves ME") rather than on the universal grace of God toward the world ("for God so loved the world")—and that this narcissistic orientation constitutes a species of idolatry; and third, that these practices, taken together, amount to blasphemy as defined by the Holy Scriptures. This critique draws upon patristic theology, the Reformed Regulative Principle of worship, and contemporary scholarly analysis.

De muzyk fan de Protestantske tsjerke is yn 'e lêste desennia ien fan 'e meast omstriden en teologysk gefolchrike striidfjilden yn it Kristendom wurden. Fier fan in gewoane estetyske diskusje oer oargel tsjin elektryske gitaar, rekket de kontroversje om Hjoeddeiske Lof- en Oanbiddingsmuzyk (HLO-muzyk) de kearn fan wat it betsjut om de God fan 'e Skrift te oanbidden—en oft in grut part fan wat as "oanbidding" trochgiet yn Protestantske gemeenten hjoed-de-dei, yn teologyske werklikheid, in foarm fan godslasterjen foarmet. Dit essay bringt trije ûnderinoar ferbûne stellingen nei foaren: earstens, dat in signifikant part fan Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk syn melody, harmony, en struktuerfûneminten (*grondfêstings*) liend hat fan New Age- en heidenske muzyktradysjes, en dat it gewoanwei oerlizzen fan "kristlik-klinkende" teksten op sokke fûneminten net hillich makket wat yn basis heidensk is; twaddens, dat de tekstynhâld fan in protte Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk antroposentrysk is ynstee fan teosentrysk—sintraal steld op it yndividu ("hoe't Jezus MY leaf hat") ynstee fan op 'e universele genede fan God foar de wrâld ("want God hie de wrâld sa leaf")—en dat dizze *selsoanbidding* (*selsfergoading*) in foarm fan ôfgoaderij foarmet; en treddens, dat dizze praktiken, tegearre naam, godslasterjen foarmje sa't de Hillige Skrift it definiearret. Dizze krityk stiet op patristyske teology, it Reformearre Regulative Prinsipe fan oanbidding, en hjoeddeiske wittenskiplike analyze.

新教教會之音樂，於近數十年間，已成為基督教界最具爭議性且神學意義最為深遠之戰場。此爭論遠非僅止於管風琴與電吉他之美學辯論，圍繞當代讚美敬拜音樂（CPW）之爭議，實觸及聖經中敬拜上帝之核心意涵——以及今日新教會眾中大量以「敬拜」為名之活動，在神學實質上是否構成褻瀆之一種形式。本文提出三項相互關聯之論題：其一，相當比例之新教敬拜音樂，係借用新紀元運動（New Age）及異教音樂傳統之旋律、和聲與結構基礎，而僅於此類基礎之上覆蓋「聽似基督教」之歌詞，並不能使本質上屬異教者成聖；其二，大量新教敬拜音樂之歌詞內容為以人為中心而非以神為中心——聚焦於個人之「我」（「耶穌如何愛我」）而非上帝對普世之恩典（「神愛世人」）——此種自戀取向構成偶像崇拜之一種型態；其三，此等實踐合而觀之，依聖經之定義構成褻瀆。本批評立基於教父神學、改革宗敬拜規範原則及當代學術分析。

II. Biblical Foundations: The Definition of Blasphemy and the Mandate of Theocentric Worship / Bibelske Fûneminten: De Definysje fan Godslasterjen en it Gebod fan Teosintryske Oanbidding / 聖經基礎：褻瀆之定義與以神為中心之敬拜誡命

A. Blasphemy Defined / Godslasterjen Definieare / 褻瀆之定義

To assess whether certain forms of Protestant worship music constitute blasphemy, one must first establish what blasphemy means in the biblical corpus. The term βλασφημία (*blasphēmia*) in the Greek New Testament denotes speech, action, or attitude that dishonors, profanes, or shows contempt for God. In the Old Testament, the Hebrew concept expressed through terms such as נָאַץ (*na'ats*, "to spurn, to blaspheme") and גָּדַף (*gadaph*, "to revile") captures the fundamental offense of treating the Holy God with irreverence, misrepresenting His nature, or directing worship toward that which is not God.

Leviticus 24:15–16 declares: *"Anyone who curses their God will be held responsible; anyone who blasphemes the name of the LORD is to be put to death."* While this verse concerns verbal cursing, the principle extends far beyond mere words. The Third Commandment—*"Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain"* (Exodus 20:7)—encompasses every act that trivializes, misuses, or profanes the name and character of God. As Reformed theologian R.C. Sproul has argued, to "take the name of the LORD in vain" includes any practice that empties God's name of its proper weight and significance, including worship that degrades or misrepresents God's character (Sproul, *The Holiness of God*, 1985).

Om te beoardieljen oft beskate foarmen fan Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk godslasterjen foarmje, moat men earst fêststelle wat godslasterjen betsjut yn it bibelske korpus. De term βλασφημία (*blasphēmia*) yn it Grykske Nije Testamint betsjut spraak, hanneling, of hâlding dy't God ûnearret, ûnthilliget, of ferachting foar God toant. Yn it Alde Testamint fetsje de Hebriuwske begripen lykas נָאַץ (*na'ats*, "fersmaadzje, lasterje") en גָּדַף (*gadaph*, "skelje") de grûnsleine mislediging fan it behanneljen fan de Hillige God mei ûnearbied, it ferkeard foarstellen fan Syn aard, of it rjochtsjen fan oanbidding nei dat wat net God is.

Levitikus 24:15–16 ferklearret: *"Elts dy't syn God flokket, sil ferantwurdlik holden wurde; elts dy't de namme fan de HEARE lasteret, moat dea makke wurde."* Wylst dit fers giet oer ferbale ferflokkjen, giet it prinsipe fier bûten inkeld wurden. It Tredde Gebod—*"Jo sille de namme fan de HEARE jo God net ydel brûke"* (Exodus 20:7)—omfettet elke hanneling dy't de namme en it karakter fan God banalisearret, misbrûkt, of ûnthilliget. Sa't de Reformearre teolooch R.C. Sproul beärgumintearre hat, omfettet it "de namme fan de HEARE ydel brûke" elke praktyk dy't Gods namme fan syn juste gewicht en betsjutting ûntdocht, ynklusyf oanbidding dy't Gods karakter degradearret of ferkeard foarstelt (Sproul, *The Holiness of God*, 1985).

欲評斷某些形式之新教敬拜音樂是否構成褻瀆，首須確立褻瀆在聖經文本中之意涵。希臘文新約中βλασφημία（*blasphēmia*）一詞，指涉任何羞辱、褻瀆或蔑視上帝之言語、行為或態度。舊約希伯來文中，如נָאַץ（*na'ats*，「藐視、褻瀆」）及גָּדַף（*gadaph*，「辱罵」）等詞彙，捕捉了以不敬對待聖潔上帝、曲解其本質，或將敬拜導向非上帝之事物此一根本性冒犯。

利未記二十四章十五至十六節宣告：「凡咒詛上帝的，必擔當自己的罪。褻瀆耶和華名的，必被治死。」此經文雖涉口頭咒詛，然其原則遠超言詞之範疇。第三誡——「不可妄稱耶和華你上帝的名」（出埃及記二十章七節）——涵蓋一切將上帝之名與性情輕忽、濫用或褻瀆之行為。誠如改革宗神學家史乜爾（R.C. Sproul）所論，「妄稱耶和華之名」包括任何使上帝之名喪失其應有莊嚴與意義之實踐，包含貶損或曲解上帝性情之敬拜（史乜爾，《上帝的聖潔》，1985年）。

B. The Theocentric Mandate / It Teosintryske Gebod / 以神為中心之誡命

Scripture is unambiguous that worship must be directed toward God and must glorify His name, not the worshipper. Isaiah 42:8 declares: *"I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images."* The Westminster Shorter Catechism (1647), echoing this conviction, famously states that the chief end of man is "to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever" (Q. 1). Worship is, by its very definition, an act of ascribing worth (*worth-ship*) to God alone.

Jesus Christ Himself established the paradigm of theocentric worship in John 4:23–24: *"But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."* The key phrase is "in truth"—worship must conform to the truth of who God is, not to the desires, emotional states, or self-centered projections of the worshipper.

Furthermore, Colossians 3:16 instructs: *"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual*

songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." The Apostle Paul specifies that the content of Christian song must be "the word of Christ" and that singing is directed "to the Lord." This is not a license for self-expressive therapeutic emotionalism; it is a command that music serve the proclamation of divine truth.

De Skrift is ûndúdlik dat oanbidding rjochte wêze moat op God en Syn namme ferhearlikje moat, net de oanbidder. Jesaja 42:8 ferklearret: *"Ik bin de HEARE: dat is Myn namme: en Myn eare sil Ik net oan in oar jaan, noch Myn lof oan graven bylden."* De Westminster Koartere Kategismus (1647), dizze oertsjûging wjerspegeljend, stelt ferneamd dat it heechste doel fan 'e minske is "God te ferhearlikjen, en Him foar ivich te genietsjen" (Fr. 1). Oanbidding is, nei syn definysje sels, in dieden fan it taskribjen fan wearde (*worth-ship*) oan God allinne.

Jezus Kristus Sels fêstige it paradigma fan teosintryske oanbidding yn Jehannes 4:23–24: *"Mar de tiid komt, en is no al, dat de wiere oanbidders de Heit oanbidde sille yn geast en yn wierheid: want de Heit siket sokken dy't Him oanbidde. God is in Geast: en dy't Him oanbidde, moatte Him oanbidde yn geast en yn wierheid."* De kaaisin is "yn wierheid"—oanbidding moat oerienstimme mei de wierheid fan wa't God is, net mei de winsken, emoasjonele tastannen, of selsrjochte projeksjes fan 'e oanbidder.

Fierders ynstruearret Kolossers 3:16: *"Lit it wurd fan Kristus ryklik yn jo wenje yn alle wiisheid; lear en formaanje inoar mei psalmen en lofsangen en geastlike lieten, sjongende mei genede yn jim herten oan 'e Heare."* De apostel Paulus spesifisearret dat de ynhâld fan kristlike sang "it wurd fan Kristus" wêze moat en dat it sjongen rjochte is "oan de Heare." Dit is gjin ferlof foar selsekspressyf terapeutysk emosjonalisme; it is in gebod dat muzyk de ferkundiging fan godlike wierheid tsjinnet.

聖經明確表示敬拜必須指向上帝，且必須榮耀祂的名，而非敬拜者自身。以賽亞書四十二章八節宣告：*「我是耶和華，這是我的名；我必不將我的榮耀歸給假神，也不將我的稱讚歸給

雕刻的偶像。」*西敏小要理問答（1647年）呼應此信念，著名地指出人的首要目的乃「榮耀上帝，並永遠以祂為樂」（問一）。敬拜就其定義本身而言，乃是將配得之尊崇（*worth-ship*）歸予上帝獨一者之行為。

耶穌基督親自建立了以神為中心之敬拜範式，記於約翰福音四章二十三至二十四節：*「時候將到，如今就是了，那真正拜父的，要用心靈和誠實拜他，因為父要這樣的人拜他。神是個靈，所以拜他的，必須用心靈和誠實拜他。」*關鍵詞組為「用誠實」（或「在真理中」）——敬拜必須符合上帝真實之所是，而非敬拜者之慾望、情緒狀態或自我中心之投射。

此外，歌羅西書三章十六節教導：*「當用各樣的智慧，把基督的道理豐豐富富地存在心裏，用詩章、頌詞、靈歌，彼此教導，互相勸戒，心被恩感，歌頌神。」*使徒保羅明示基督徒歌唱之內容必須是「基督的道理」，且歌唱乃是「歌頌神」。此非對自我表達式治療性情緒主義之許可；此乃音樂當服事於宣揚神聖真理之誡命。

III. The Pagan and New Age Foundations of Protestant Worship Music / De Heidenske en New Age-Fûneminten fan Protestantske Oanbiddingsmuzyk / 新教敬拜音樂之異教與新紀元基礎

A. Historical Precedent: The Early Church's Rejection of Pagan Music / Histoarysk Presesint: De Earste Tsjerke syn Fersmiten fan Heidenske Muzyk / 歷史先例：初代教會對異教音樂之拒斥

The early Church Fathers were acutely aware of the dangers of incorporating pagan musical traditions into Christian worship. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215 AD), in his *Paedagogus*, severely condemned the use of instruments associated with pagan worship and banned melodies connected to pagan festivals and sensuality. He wrote that Christians must "banish songs of this nature entirely" because they were designed to arouse passions unsuited to the worship of the true God (Clement, *Paed.* II.4). Tertullian (c. 160–220 AD) likewise argued that all entertainments and their associated

music that were "dedicated to pagan gods—or as Tertullian put it in typically blunt fashion, demons"—were incompatible with a Christian's baptismal vow (as noted by Christian History Institute, 2012). The patristic scholar James McKinnon, in his landmark study *Music in Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), documented the "vehemence and uniformity" with which the Church Fathers opposed the incorporation of pagan musical forms into worship, a consensus that persisted for approximately five centuries.

As music historian Donald Grout observed: "Until the feeling of pleasure attached to these kinds of music could be somehow transferred from the theater and the marketplace to the church, they were distrusted" (Grout, *A History of Western Music*, 1960). This patristic caution was not arbitrary conservatism—it was theological vigilance rooted in the conviction that music carries spiritual associations and that forms born in pagan worship retain those associations even when overlaid with Christian words.

De earste tsjerkeheiten wiene skerp bewust fan de gefaren fan it opnimmen fan heidenske muzyktradysjes yn kristlike oanbidding. Klemens fan Aleksandrje (c. 150–215 n.Kr.), yn syn *Paedagogus*, feroardiele skerp it brûken fan ynstruminten ferbûn mei heidenske oanbidding en ferbea melodyen ferbûn mei heidenske feesten en sinlikens. Hy skreau dat kristenen "lieten fan dizze aard folslein ferbanne moatte" om't se ûntwurpen wiene om hertstochten te wekken dy't net passe by de oanbidding fan de wiere God (Klemens, *Paed.* II.4). Tertullianus (c. 160–220 n.Kr.) beärgumintearre lyksa dat alle ferdivedaasje en de byhearrende muzyk dy't "wijd wiene oan heidenske goaden—of sa't Tertullianus it yn syn typysk rûge wize sei, demoanen"—ûnferienber wiene mei de doopbelofte fan in kristen (sa't it Christian History Institute opmerkt, 2012). De patristyske gelearde James McKinnon, yn syn baanbrekende stúdzje *Music in Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), dokumintearre de "fûleindichheid en ienfoarmichheid" (*felle-ienstimmichheid*) wêrmei de tsjerkeheiten de

ynkorporaasje fan heidenske muzykfoarmen yn oanbidding tsjinstiene, in konsensus dy't ûngefear fiif ieuwen oanhâlde.

Sa't muzykhistoarikus Donald Grout opmerke: "Oant it gefoel fan genot ferbûn oan dizze soarten muzyk op ien of oare wize oerbrocht wurde koe fan it teater en de merke nei de tsjerke, waarden se wantroud" (Grout, *A History of Western Music*, 1960). Dizze patristyske foarsichtigens wie gjin willekeurich konservatisme—it wie teologyske waaksamheid woartele yn de oertsjûging dat muzyk geastlike assosjaasjes draacht en dat foarmen berne yn heidenske oanbidding dy assosjaasjes behâlde sels as se oerdutsen wurde mei kristlike wurden.

初代教父們對於將異教音樂傳統納入基督教敬拜之危險，有著敏銳之覺察。亞歷山大的革利免（約公元150–215年）於其《導師篇》（*Paedagogus*）中，嚴厲譴責使用與異教崇拜相關之樂器，並禁止與異教節慶及情慾相關之旋律。他寫道，基督徒必須「徹底驅逐此類歌曲」，因其旨在喚起不適於敬拜真神之情慾（革利免，《導師篇》II.4）。特土良（約公元160–220年）同樣主張，一切「奉獻給異教之神——或如特土良以其慣常之直率措辭所言，魔鬼」之娛樂及其相關音樂，皆與基督徒之洗禮誓約不相容（基督教歷史研究所，2012年所載）。教父學者詹姆斯·麥金農（James McKinnon）於其里程碑式之研究《早期基督教文獻中的音樂》（劍橋大學出版社，1987年）中，記錄了教父們反對將異教音樂形式納入敬拜時之「猛烈性與一致性」，此共識持續了約五個世紀。

誠如音樂史學家唐納德·格勞特（Donald Grout）所觀察：「在附著於此類音樂之愉悅感能以某種方式從劇場和市集轉移到教會之前，它們是被不信任的」（格勞特，《西方音樂史》，1960年）。此教父時代之審慎態度非任意之保守主義——而是根植於此信念之神學警覺：音樂承載靈性之關聯，而誕生於異教崇拜之形式，即便覆以基督教歌詞，仍保有彼等關聯。

B. The Modern Adoption of Pagan and New Age Musical Forms / De Moderne Oanname fan Heidenske en New Age-Muzykfoarmen / 現代對異教與新紀元音樂形式之採用

The contemporary Protestant worship music industry has, in large measure, reversed the patristic consensus. Scholars such as T. David Gordon, in *Why Johnny Can't Sing Hymns: How Pop Culture Rewrote the Hymnal* (P&R Publishing, 2010), have demonstrated that the CPW movement systematically imports its musical idiom from secular pop culture—which itself draws heavily upon musical traditions with roots in New Age spirituality, Eastern mysticism, and neo-pagan aesthetics. Gordon argues that the "cultural assumptions of contemporaneity" have been uncritically imported into the church, such that the musical forms of worship have become indistinguishable from the world (Gordon, 2010).

The practice of adapting secular or pagan melodies for Christian use has a contested history. While some defenders of contemporary worship music invoke the myth that Martin Luther borrowed melodies from "bar songs" (German: *Barlied*), musicological research has conclusively debunked this claim. As Robin Leaver demonstrates in *Luther's Liturgical Music* (Eerdmans, 2007), the term "bar" in German music referred not to a tavern but to a specific poetic-musical form (AAB structure). Luther drew primarily from existing sacred chant and German religious folk traditions, not from tavern drinking songs (see also the research compiled at religiousaffections.org, "Did Luther Use Tunes from Love Songs?"). The claim that Luther's practice legitimizes the wholesale importation of secular pop music into the church is, therefore, historically unfounded.

What is occurring in the modern CPW movement is categorically different from any historical precedent. The musical vocabulary of many contemporary worship songs—their use of ambient soundscapes, repetitive trance-like progressions, ethereal synthesizer pads, and emotionally manipulative crescendo-decrescendo dynamics—bears striking resemblance to the musical techniques employed in New Age meditation music and neo-pagan ritual practice. Dan Lucarini, a former worship leader who left the contemporary Christian music movement, documented this phenomenon in

Why I Left the Contemporary Christian Music Movement (Evangelical Press, 2002), arguing that the deliberate adoption of rock and pop musical idioms carries with it the spiritual freight of those traditions. As Lucarini observed, "our acceptance of CCM into worship services has hurt an entire generation of older Christians, has led to church splits," and has introduced a mode of musical expression fundamentally alien to the character of biblical worship.

De hjoeddeiske Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk-yndustry hat, yn grutte mjitte, de patristyske konsensus weromset. Gelearden lykas T. David Gordon, yn *Why Johnny Can't Sing Hymns: How Pop Culture Rewrote the Hymnal* (P&R Publishing, 2010), hawwe oantoand dat de HLO-beweging systematysk syn muzykidioom ymportearret fan sekuliere popkultuer—dy't sels swier lutsen hat op muzyktradysjes mei woartels yn New Age-spiritualiteit, Easterske mystyk, en neo-heidenske estetyk. Gordon beärgumintearret dat de "kulturele oannames fan hjoeddeiskens" (*kontemporaneïteit*) ûnkrityk ymportearre binne yn de tsjerke, sadat de muzykfoarmen fan oanbidding net mear te ûnderskieden binne fan de wrâld (Gordon, 2010).

De praktyk fan it oanpassen fan sekuliere of heidenske melodyen foar kristlik gebrûk hat in omstriden skiednis. Wylst guon ferdigeners fan hjoeddeiske oanbiddingsmuzyk it mythe oanroppe dat Maarten Luther melodyen liende fan "kroechlieten" (Dútsk: *Barlied*), hat muzykwittenskiplik ûndersyk dit bewearing konklúsyf ûntkrêftige. Sa't Robin Leaver oantoant yn *Luther's Liturgical Music* (Eerdmans, 2007), ferwize de term "bar" yn Dútske muzyk net nei in kroech mar nei in spesifike poetysk-muzykale foarm (AAB-struktuer). Luther pute primêr út besteande hillige sjongwizen en Dútske religieuze folktradysjes, net út kroech-drinklieten. De bewearing dat de praktyk fan Luther de gruthannele ymport fan sekuliere popmuzyk yn de tsjerke legitimearret, is dêrom histoarysk ûnfûn.

Wat yn de moderne HLO-beweging bart, is kategorys oars as hokker histoarysk presesint dan ek. It muzykfokabulêr fan in protte hjoeddeiske oanbiddingslieten—harren gebrûk fan omjouwingsklanklannen (*sfearmuzykskippen*), werhellende trâns-achtige progresjes, eteryske synthesizer-pads, en emosjoneel manipulearjende crescendo-decrescendo-dynamiken—toant opfallende oerienkomst mei de muzyktechniken brûkt yn New Age-meditaasjemuzyk en neo-heidenske rituele praktyk. Dan Lucarini, in eardere oanbiddingslieder dy't de hjoeddeiske kristlike muzyk-beweging ferlitten hat, dokumintearre dit ferskynsel yn *Why I Left the Contemporary Christian Music Movement* (Evangelical Press, 2002), en beärgumintearre dat de bewuste oanname fan rock- en pop-muzykidiomen it geastlike gewicht fan dy tradysjes meidraacht.

當代新教敬拜音樂產業在很大程度上顛覆了教父時代之共識。如T·大衛·戈登（T. David Gordon）於《為何強尼不能唱聖詩：流行文化如何改寫了聖詩集》（P&R出版社，2010年）中所論證，當代讚美敬拜運動系統性地從世俗流行文化中引進其音樂語彙——而世俗流行文化本身大量汲取自根植於新紀元靈性、東方神秘主義與新異教美學之音樂傳統。戈登主張，「當代性之文化預設」已被不加批判地引入教會，以致敬拜之音樂形式與世界已不可區分（戈登，2010年）。

將世俗或異教旋律改編為基督教用途之做法，有其爭議性之歷史。部分當代敬拜音樂之辯護者援引馬丁·路德曾從「酒館歌曲」（德語：*Barlied*）借用旋律之迷思，然而音樂學研究已確定性地破除此說。誠如羅賓·利弗（Robin Leaver）於《路德之禮拜音樂》（Eerdmans出版社，2007年）中所論證，德國音樂中「bar」一詞所指非酒館，而是一種特定之詩歌音樂形式（AAB結構）。路德主要取材自既有之神聖聖詠及德國宗教民間傳統，而非酒館飲酒歌。因此，聲稱路德之做法使大量引進世俗流行音樂入教會具有正當性，實為歷史上無根據之說。

現代讚美敬拜運動中所發生之事，在本質上不同於任何歷史先例。許多當代敬拜歌曲之音樂語彙——其使用環境音景、重複之恍惚式進行、空靈之合成器音墊，以及情緒操控性之漸強漸弱動態——與新紀元冥想音樂及新異教儀式實踐中所使用之音樂技法有驚人之相似。

丹·路加利尼（Dan Lucarini），一位離開當代基督教音樂運動之前敬拜領袖，於《我為何離開當代基督教音樂運動》（福音出版社，2002年）中記錄此現象，主張刻意採用搖滾及流行音樂語彙必然承載該等傳統之靈性負擔。

C. The Contrafactum Fallacy: Changing Words Does Not Change the Spirit / De Contrafactum-Misfetting: Wurden Feroarje Feroaret de Geast Net / 套詞謬誤：更換歌詞不等於更換靈

The practice of writing new Christian lyrics to pre-existing secular or pagan melodies—known in musicology as *contrafactum*—raises a profound theological question: does the substitution of words sanctify a fundamentally pagan musical form? Scripture answers with a resounding negative.

In Deuteronomy 12:29–31, God commands Israel: *"When the LORD thy God shall cut off the nations from before thee, whither thou goest to possess them, and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their land; take heed to thyself that thou be not snared by following them, after that they be destroyed from before thee; and that thou enquire not after their gods, saying, How did these nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise. Thou shalt not do so unto the LORD thy God: for every abomination to the LORD, which he hateth, have they done unto their gods."* This passage does not merely prohibit worshipping pagan gods—it explicitly prohibits adopting the *methods* and *forms* of pagan worship and applying them to the worship of the true God. The principle is categorical: God will not be worshipped in the manner of the pagans, regardless of the worshipper's subjective intent.

2 Corinthians 6:14–17 reinforces this principle with unmistakable clarity: *"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what*

agreement hath the temple of God with idols? ... Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord."

To take a melody composed for pagan meditation, New Age "spiritual awakening," or secular hedonistic entertainment, and to overlay it with lines such as "Jesus, You are my everything" is an act of syncretism precisely analogous to what the Israelites did when they worshipped the golden calf while claiming to worship YHWH (Exodus 32:4–5). Aaron fashioned the calf and declared: *"These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."* The people then said, *"Tomorrow is a feast to the LORD."* They used the *name* of the LORD, but the *form* of worship was pagan. This is the biblical paradigm of blasphemous syncretism—and it is precisely what occurs when Protestant churches adopt pagan musical forms and dress them in Christian language.

De praktyk fan it skriuwen fan nije kristlike teksten op al-besteande sekuliere of heidenske melodyen—yn de muzykwittenskip bekend as *contrafactum*—ropt in djipgeande teologyske fraach op: hilliget de ferfanging fan wurden in fûneminteel heidenske muzykfoarm? De Skrift antwurdet mei in oertsjûgjend nee.

Yn Deuteronomium 12:29–31 gebiedt God Israel: *"As de HEARE jo God de folken foar jo ôfsnijt, dêr't jo hinne geane om se te besitte, ... hoed josels dat jo net yn 'e strik rinne troch harren te folgjen, ... en dat jo net freegje nei harren goaden, sizzende, Hoe tsjinnen dizze folken harren goaden? sels sa sil ik itselde dwaan. Jo sille sa net dwaan oan de HEARE jo God: want alle grouweldieden fan de HEARE, dy't Er hatet, hawwe hja oan harren goaden dien."* Dit passaazje ferbiedt net allinne it oanbidden fan heidenske goaden—it ferbiedt útdruklik it oernimmen fan de *metoaden* en *foarmen* fan heidenske oanbidding en it tapassen dêrfan op de oanbidding fan de wiere God. It prinsipe is kategorys: God sil net oanbidden wurde op de wize fan de heidenen, ûnôfhinklik fan de subjektive bedoeling fan de oanbidder.

2 Korintiërs 6:14–17 fersterket dit prinsipe mei ûnmiskenber dúdlikheid: *"Lit jo net yn in ûngelyk span sette mei ûnleauwigen: want hokker mienskip hat rjochtfeardichheid mei ûnrjochtfeardichheid? en hokker gemeinskap hat ljocht mei tsjuster? En hokker oerienstimming hat Kristus mei Belial? ... Dêrom gean út harren midden en wês ôfskieden, seit de Heare."*

Om in melody komponearre foar heidenske meditaasje, New Age "geastlike ûntwekking," of sekuliere hedonistyske ferdivedaasje te nimmen, en it te oerdekken mei rigels lykas "Jezus, Jo binne myn alles" is in died fan synkretisme krekt analoog oan wat de Israeliten diene doe't se it gouden keal oanbidden wylst se beweare de HEARE te oanbidden (Exodus 32:4–5). Aäron foarme it keal en ferklearre: *"Dit binne jo goaden, O Israel, dy't jo út it lân fan Egypte brochten."* It folk sei doe: *"Moarn is in feest foar de HEARE."* Hja brûkten de *namme* fan de HEARE, mar de *foarm* fan oanbidding wie heidensk. Dit is it bibelske paradigma fan godslasterjende synkretisme—en it is krekt wat bart as Protestantske tsjerken heidenske muzykfoarmen oannimme en se yn kristlike taal klaaie.

將新的基督教歌詞寫在既有之世俗或異教旋律之上——音樂學中稱為套詞法（*contrafactum*）——引發一個深刻之神學問題：歌詞之替換是否能使一個本質上屬異教之音樂形式成聖？聖經以響亮之否定回答之。

申命記十二章二十九至三十一節中，上帝命令以色列人：「耶和華你的神將你要去趕出的國民從你面前剪除……你要謹慎，不可在他們除滅之後隨從他們的網羅，也不可訪問他們的神說：『這些國民怎樣事奉他們的神，我也要照樣行。』你不可向耶和華你的神這樣行；因為他們向他們的神行了耶和華所憎嫌所恨惡的一切事。」此段經文不僅禁止崇拜異教之神——更明確禁止採用異教崇拜之方法與形式而將之應用於對真神之敬拜。此原則具範疇性：上帝不接受以異教之方式被敬拜，無論敬拜者之主觀意圖如何。

哥林多後書六章十四至十七節以不可誤解之清晰強化此原則：「你們和不信的原不相配，不要同負一軛。義和不義有甚麼相交呢？光明和黑暗有甚麼相通呢？基督和彼列有甚麼相和呢？……你們務要從他們中間出來，與他們分別。」

取一首為異教冥想、新紀元「靈性覺醒」或世俗享樂主義娛樂而作之旋律，覆以「耶穌，祢是我的一切」之類歌詞，此乃一種融合主義（syncretism）之行為，恰與以色列人崇拜金牛犢時聲稱敬拜耶和華之事完全類似（出埃及記三十二章四至五節）。亞倫鑄造金牛犢並宣告：「以色列啊，這是領你出埃及地的神！」百姓隨後說：「明日是向耶和華守的節期。」他們使用了耶和華之名，然而敬拜之形式卻是異教的。此乃褻瀆性融合主義之聖經範式——而這正是新教教會採用異教音樂形式並以基督教語言裝扮之時所發生之事。

IV. The Idolatry of Self: "How Jesus Loves ME" versus "God So Loved the World" / De Ôfgoaderij fan it Sels: "Hoe't Jezus MY Leaf Hat" tsjin "God Hie de Wrâld sa Leaf" / 自我之偶像崇拜：「耶穌如何愛我」對「神愛世人」

A. The Anthropocentric Turn in Protestant Worship Lyrics / De Antroposintryske Kear yn Protestantske Oanbiddingsteksten / 新教敬拜歌詞中之以人為中心之轉向

Perhaps the most insidious form of blasphemy in contemporary Protestant worship music is not the importation of pagan musical forms, but the subtle replacement of God with the self as the object of worship. Marva Dawn, in her seminal work *Reaching Out Without Dumbing Down: A Theology of Worship for This Urgent Time* (Eerdmans, 1995), warned that the "dumbing down" of worship was creating a consumer-driven, self-focused spirituality that replaced the adoration of God with emotional self-gratification. Dawn argued that when worship becomes a means of making the worshipper "feel good," it has ceased to be worship and has become a form of idolatry—the worship of the self through the medium of religious sentiment.

The evidence is overwhelming. As the investigative article in *Relevant Magazine* ("Enough With Me-Centered Worship Music") documented, a vast proportion of contemporary worship lyrics center on the first-person singular: "I," "me," "my." The theological trajectory is clear: the worshipper becomes the subject of worship, and God is reduced to an instrument of personal comfort, emotional validation, or therapeutic healing. Consider the linguistic structure of many popular CPW songs: "You love *me*," "You died for *me*," "*I* am free," "*I* am changed," "You're all *I* need." While individual statements of faith are not inherently wrong, when the overwhelming preponderance of congregational singing is oriented toward the self, the cumulative effect is the creation of a narcissistic spirituality.

Shawn Brace, a pastor and doctoral candidate at the University of Oxford, has argued that "evangelical worship music has formed us to be people that focus almost exclusively on our private and personal relationship with God and our individual and personal problems. Almost every song is about one's private relation to him—mostly focusing on the assurance that God will work everything out for us" (Brace, "Why I've Been Struggling With Contemporary Worship Music Lately," 2025). Brace traces this trend to nineteenth-century revivalism, noting the dramatic shift from the transcendent, communal orientation of earlier hymnody—exemplified by Martin Luther's "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God" and Francis of Assisi's "All Creatures of Our God and King"—to the intensely personal, individualistic orientation of Fanny Crosby's "Blessed Assurance, Jesus Is Mine!" and Annie Hawks's "I Need Thee Every Hour." The contemporary worship movement, Brace argues, has intensified this individualism to an extreme degree.

Miskien is de meast ûndermynske foarm fan godslasterjen yn hjoeddeiske Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk net de ymport fan heidenske muzykfoarmen, mar de subtile ferfanging fan God troch it sels as it objekt fan oanbidding. Marva Dawn, yn har

baanbrekende wurk *Reaching Out Without Dumbing Down: A Theology of Worship for This Urgent Time* (Eerdmans, 1995), warskôge dat de "ferdoming" (*ôfdommen*) fan oanbidding in konsumint-oandreaune, selsrjochte spiritualiteit kreëarre dy't de oanbidding fan God ferfongen hat troch emoasjonele selsbefrediging. Dawn beärgumintearre dat as oanbidding in middel wurdt om de oanbidder "goed fiele" te litten, it ophâlden is oanbidding te wêzen en in foarm fan ôfgoaderij wurden is—de oanbidding fan it sels troch it medium fan religieus sentimint.

It bewiis is oerweldigjend. Sa't it ûndersyksartikel yn *Relevant Magazine* ("Enough With Me-Centered Worship Music") dokumintearre, sintrearret in grut part fan hjoeddeiske oanbiddingsteksten om de earste persoan inkelvâld: "ik," "my," "myn." De teologyske trajektory is dúdlik: de oanbidder wurdt it ûnderwerp fan oanbidding, en God wurdt redusearre ta in ynstrumint fan persoanlik treast, emoasjonele falidaasje, of terapeutyske genêzing. Beskôgje de taalkundige struktuer fan in protte populêre HLO-lieten: "Jo hâlde fan *my*," "Jo stoaren foar *my*," "*Ik* bin frij," "*Ik* bin feroare," "Jo binne alles wat *ik* nedich haw." Wylst yndividuele útspraken fan leauwe net ynherint ferkeard binne, as de oerweldigjende oerhearskjende mearderheid fan gemeentlike sang rjochte is op it sels, is it kumulative effekt de skepping fan in narsissistyske spiritualiteit.

Shawn Brace, in dûmny en doktoraal kandidaat oan de Universiteit fan Oxford, hat beärgumintearre dat "evangelyske oanbiddingsmuzyk ús foarme hat ta minsken dy't hast eksklusyf fokusje op ús privee en persoanlike relaasje mei God en ús yndividuele en persoanlike problemen" (Brace, 2025). Brace folget dizze trend werom nei njoggentjinde-ieuske revivalisme, en merkt de dramatyske ferskowing op fan de transendinte, mienskiplike oriïntaasje fan eardere hymnody—eksemplifisearre troch Maarten Luther syn "In Fêste Boarch Is Us God" en Franciscus fan Assisi syn "Alle

Skepsels fan Us God en Kening"—nei de yntinsyf persoanlike, yndividualistyske oriïntaasje fan Fanny Crosby har "Seinge Wissichheid, Jezus Is Mines!"

或許當代新教敬拜音樂中最隱伏之褻瀆形式，非異教音樂形式之引進，而是以自我悄然取代上帝作為敬拜之對象。馬爾瓦·唐恩（Marva Dawn）於其開創性著作《伸出而不降格：此緊迫時代之敬拜神學》（Eerdmans出版社，1995年）中警告，敬拜之「降格」正在創造一種消費者驅動、以自我為中心之靈性，以情緒上之自我滿足取代對上帝之敬拜。唐恩主張，當敬拜成為使敬拜者「感覺良好」之手段時，它便不再是敬拜，而已成為偶像崇拜之一種形式——透過宗教情感之媒介進行自我崇拜。

證據是壓倒性的。如《相關雜誌》（*Relevant Magazine*）之調查文章（〈夠了，以我為中心的敬拜音樂〉）所記錄，大量當代敬拜歌詞圍繞第一人稱單數：「我」、「我的」。其神學軌跡清晰可見：敬拜者成為敬拜之主體，而上帝被降格為個人安慰、情緒認證或治療性療癒之工具。試觀許多流行讚美敬拜歌曲之語言結構：「你愛我」、「你為我死」、「我得自由」、「我被改變」、「你是我所需的一切」。雖個別之信仰宣告並非本質上有誤，然當會眾歌唱之壓倒性多數皆朝向自我時，其累積效果便是創造一種自戀式靈性。

肖恩·布雷斯（Shawn Brace），牧師暨牛津大學博士候選人，主張「福音派敬拜音樂已塑造我們成為幾乎專注於我們與上帝之私人個人關係及我們個人問題之人。幾乎每首歌都是關於人與祂的私人關係——主要聚焦於上帝會為我們解決一切的確信」（布雷斯，2025年）。布雷斯將此趨勢追溯至十九世紀之復興運動，指出從早期聖詩之超越性、群體性取向——如馬丁·路德之〈上帝是我堅固堡壘〉及亞西西的方濟各之〈上帝與君王的萬物〉——到芬妮·克羅斯比（Fanny Crosby）之〈有福的確據，耶穌屬我〉及安妮·乎克斯（Annie Hawks）之〈每時刻我需要祢〉之強烈個人化、個體主義取向的劇烈轉變。當代敬拜運動，布雷斯主張，已將此個體主義推至極端程度。

B. Biblical Contrast: "God So Loved the World" / Bibelske Kontrastearring: "God Hie de Wrâld Sa Leaf" / 聖經之對比：「神愛世人」

The contrast between the self-centered orientation of CPW music and the theocentric, universalist orientation of Scripture could not be more stark. John 3:16 declares: *"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."* The subject of this verse is God. The verb is "loved." The object is "the world"—not "me," not "the individual worshipper," but the entire cosmos of created humanity. The grace of God is directed outward and universally, not inward and narcissistically.

Psalm 96:1–3 commands: *"O sing unto the LORD a new song: sing unto the LORD, all the earth. Sing unto the LORD, bless his name; shew forth his salvation from day to day. Declare his glory among the heathen, his wonders among all people."* The Psalmist does not say "sing about how God makes you feel." The imperative is to declare His glory, His salvation, His wonders—among all people, not merely for the emotional edification of the individual singer.

As the article in *Relevant Magazine* forcefully argued: "Worship isn't about looking within ourselves to find the strength and resolve to do better. It's about confessing our own inability to do just that. It's about taking a deliberate break from making much of ourselves—something many of us could really use—and making much of God instead." A.W. Tozer, the great twentieth-century prophet of worship, warned presciently: "The church that can't worship must be entertained. And men who can't lead a church to worship must provide the entertainment" (Tozer, *Worship: The Missing Jewel*, n.d.). What Tozer foresaw has come to pass: worship has been replaced by entertainment, and God has been dethroned in favor of the consumer-worshipper.

It kontrast tusken de selsrjochte oriïntaasje fan HLO-muzyk en de teosintryske, universalistyske oriïntaasje fan de Skrift kin net skerper wêze. Jehannes 3:16 ferklearret: *"Want God hie de wrâld sa leaf, dat Er Syn iennichstberne Soan jûn hat, dat elts dy't yn Him leaut net ferlern gean sil, mar it ivige libben hat."* It ûnderwerp fan dit

fers is God. It tiidwurd is "hie leaf." It objekt is "de wrâld"—net "my," net "de yndividuele oanbidder," mar de hiele kosmos fan skeppen minskdom. De genede fan God is nei bûten en universeel rjochte, net nei binnen en narsissistysk.

Psalm 96:1–3 gebiedt: *"O sjong oan de HEARE in nij liet: sjong oan de HEARE, alle ierde. Sjong oan de HEARE, segenje Syn namme; ferkundigje Syn heil fan dei ta dei. Ferklearje Syn eare ûnder de heidenen, Syn wûnders ûnder alle folken."* De Psalmist seit net "sjong oer hoe't God jo fiele lit." It gebod is om Syn eare, Syn heil, Syn wûnders te ferklearjen—ûnder alle folken, net allinne foar de emoasjonele stichting fan de yndividuele sjonger.

Sa't it artikel yn *Relevant Magazine* krêftich beärgumintearre: "Oanbidding giet net oer it sjen yn ússels om de krêft en beslútfeardigens te finen om better te dwaan. It giet oer it beliden fan ús eigen ûnfermogen om krekt dat te dwaan. It giet oer it opsetlik ophâlden fan it grut meitsjen fan ússels—en it grut meitsjen fan God ynstee." A.W. Tozer, de grutte tweintichste-ieuske profeet fan oanbidding, warskôge foarútsêand: "De tsjerke dy't net oanbidde kin, moat fermakke wurde. En manlju dy't in tsjerke net liede kinne ta oanbidding, moatte it fermaak leverje" (Tozer, *Worship: The Missing Jewel*).

以自我為中心之讚美敬拜音樂取向與聖經之以神為中心、普世性取向之間的對比，不可能更為鮮明。約翰福音三章十六節宣告：*「神愛世人，甚至將他的獨生子賜給他們，叫一切信他的，不至滅亡，反得永生。」*此節經文之主詞是上帝。動詞是「愛」。受詞是「世人」——非「我」，非「個別的敬拜者」，而是受造人類之整體。上帝之恩典向外而普世地指向，而非向內而自戀地指向。

詩篇九十六篇一至三節命令：*「你們要向耶和華唱新歌！全地都要向耶和華歌唱！要向耶和華歌唱，稱頌他的名！天天傳揚他的救恩。在列邦中述說他的榮耀！在萬民中述說他的奇事！」*詩人並未說「唱述上帝使你有何感受」。命令是宣告祂的榮耀、祂的救恩、祂的奇事——在萬民之中，而非僅為個別歌唱者之情緒造就。

誠如《相關雜誌》之文章有力論述:「敬拜不是向內尋找力量和決心以做得更好。而是承認我們自己無力做到。是刻意停止彰顯我們自己——而代之以彰顯上帝。」二十世紀偉大的敬拜先知陶乃爾(A.W. Tozer)曾有先見之明地警告:「不能敬拜的教會必須被娛樂。不能帶領教會敬拜的人必須提供娛樂」(陶乃爾,《敬拜:失落的珍寶》)。陶乃爾所預見者已然成真:敬拜已被娛樂所取代,上帝已被廢黜而代之以消費者—敬拜者。

C. The Theological Danger of Self-Centered Worship / It Teologyske Gefaar fan Selsrjochte Oanbidding / 以自我為中心之敬拜的神學危險

The theological danger of this anthropocentric turn cannot be overstated. When worship becomes primarily about the individual's feelings, experiences, and personal relationship with God—to the exclusion of God's transcendence, sovereignty, holiness, justice, and universal grace—the worshipper has effectively created a god in his own image. This is precisely the sin condemned in Romans 1:21–25: *"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man ... Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever."*

The self-centered worshipper who sings "Jesus loves *me*" to the exclusion of "God so loved *the world*" has effectively exchanged the glory of the transcendent God for an idol fashioned after the worshipper's own emotional needs. As Braden McKinley has documented in his study "The Neglect of Confession in Contemporary Worship Music" (*Artistic Theologian*, 2024), the CPW movement's emphasis on personal intimacy and emotional experience has systematically excluded the corporate confession of sin—a practice that has been central to Christian worship since its inception. When confession is absent, the worshipper is implicitly told that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with

the self; the self needs comfort, affirmation, and celebration, not repentance. This is not worship—it is self-deification.

Adam Perez, a liturgical scholar, captures this insight precisely: "God's power is not primarily known through individual encounters, but rather through communal ones. As we remember salvation history throughout our worship, we remember that God's acts of salvation were directed towards a community" (Perez and Litz, "Towards a Reformed Perspective on Contemporary Praise and Worship Music," *Reformed Journal*, 2023). The individualism of CPW music thus represents not merely a stylistic preference but a theological error—a denial of the corporate, covenantal nature of God's relationship with His people.

It teologyske gefaar fan dizze antroposintryske kear kin net oerdreaun wurde. As oanbidding primêr giet oer de gefoelens, ûnderfinings, en persoanlike relaasje fan it yndividu mei God—mei útsluting fan Gods transendinsje, soevereiniteit, hillichheid, rjochtfeardigens, en universele genede—hat de oanbidder effektyf in god yn syn eigen byld skeppen. Dit is krekt de sûnde feroardiele yn Romeinen 1:21–25: *"Om't, doe't hja God koene, hja Him net ferhearlikje as God, noch tankber wiene; mar ydel waarden yn harren tinzen, en harren dwaze hert waard fertsjustere. Harsels wiis neamend, waarden hja dwazen, en feroare de eare fan de ûnfergonklike God yn in byld lyk makke oan fergonklike minsken ... Dy't de wierheid fan God yn in leagen feroare, en it skepsel oanbidden en tsjinnen mear as de Skepper, dy't seinge is foar ivich."*

De selsrjochte oanbidder dy't sjongt "Jezus hat *my* leaf" mei útsluting fan "God hie *de wrâld* sa leaf" hat effektyf de eare fan de transendinte God ferruile foar in ôfgod foarme nei de eigen emoasjonele behoeften fan 'e oanbidder. Sa't Braden McKinley dokumintearre hat yn syn stúdzje "The Neglect of Confession in Contemporary Worship Music" (*Artistic Theologian*, 2024), hat de fokus fan de HLO-beweging op persoanlike yntimiteit en emoasjonele ûnderfining systematysk de mienskiplike skuldbetizing

útsletten—in praktyk dy't sintraal west hat yn kristlike oanbidding sûnt it begjin. As skuldbetizing ôfwêzich is, wurdt de oanbidder ymplisyt ferteld dat der neat fûneminteel mis is mei it sels; it sels hat treast, befêstiging, en fiering nedich, net berou. Dit is gjin oanbidding—it is *selsfergoding* (*autolâtrije*).

此以人為中心之轉向的神學危險，怎麼強調都不為過。當敬拜主要成為關於個人之感受、經歷及與上帝之私人關係——而排除上帝之超越性、主權、聖潔、公義及普世恩典——敬拜者便已有效地照自己的形象造了一個神。此正是羅馬書一章二十一至二十五節所譴責之罪：「因為他們雖然知道神，卻不當作神榮耀他，也不感謝他。他們的思念變為虛妄，無知的心就昏暗了。自稱為聰明，反成了愚拙，將不能朽壞之神的榮耀變為偶像，彷彿必朽壞的人的樣式……他們將神的真實變為虛謊，去敬拜事奉受造之物，不敬奉那造物的主——主乃是可稱頌的，直到永遠。」

以「耶穌愛我」而排斥「神愛世人」之以自我為中心的敬拜者，已有效地將超越之上帝的榮耀，換成了按敬拜者自身情感需要所塑之偶像。誠如布萊登·麥金利（Braden McKinley）於其研究〈當代敬拜音樂中認罪之忽略〉（《藝術神學人》，2024年）中所記錄，讚美敬拜運動對個人親密感與情緒體驗之強調，已系統性地排除了團體認罪之實踐——此實踐自基督教敬拜之肇始即為其核心。當認罪缺席時，敬拜者被隱含地告知自我並無根本性之錯誤；自我需要的是安慰、肯定與慶祝，而非悔改。此非敬拜——此乃自我神化（*autolâtreia*）。

V. The Regulative Principle and the Scriptural Standard for Worship / It Regulatyf Prinsipe en de Skriftlike Standert foar Oanbidding / 規範原則與敬拜之聖經標準

The Reformed tradition has provided the most rigorous theological framework for evaluating worship practices through the Regulative Principle of Worship. As articulated in the Westminster Confession of Faith (21.1): "The acceptable way of worshiping the true God is instituted by himself and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not

be worshiped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture."

Michael Farley, in his study "What is 'Biblical' Worship? Biblical Hermeneutics and Evangelical Theologies of Worship" (*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 2008), argues that the entire canon of Scripture—both Old and New Testaments—must regulate what is permitted in worship. Matt Merker, in *Corporate Worship: How the Church Gathers as God's People* (Crossway, 2021), defines the principle succinctly: "God, by his Word, governs what the local church should do when it gathers." The Regulative Principle stands as a bulwark against the kind of pragmatic, market-driven approach to worship that has characterized the Church Growth and Seeker-Sensitive movements—movements that, as Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong document in *A History of Contemporary Praise & Worship* (Baker Academic, 2021), explicitly prioritized cultural accommodation and numerical growth over biblical fidelity.

The theological deficiency of the Church Growth approach was acknowledged even by one of its former practitioners. Paul Carter, a former seeker-sensitive pastor, admitted: "The basic logic of the seeker-sensitive movement was that we would get people in the door by playing contemporary music, singing contemporary songs, speaking contemporary jargon and addressing contemporary issues" (Carter, "Why I Abandoned Seeker Church," *The Gospel Coalition*, 2018). The worship service was redesigned not to glorify God but to attract consumers—a fundamental inversion of the biblical purpose of worship.

Gene Edward Veith, in his essay "Church Music and Contemporary Culture" (*Modern Reformation*), observed that the attempt to make worship "contemporary" by importing popular music styles inevitably privileges one cultural group while alienating others, and that the resulting worship is neither authentically contemporary nor authentically

Christian. Veith argued instead for the rich, diverse heritage of church music across centuries and cultures, noting that "in today's climate, if a church seizes upon one particular style of popular music, then that will privilege those whose music is chosen and alienate everyone else."

De Reformearre tradysje hat it meast stringe teologyske ramt levere foar it evaluearjen fan oanbiddingspraktiken troch it Regulatyf Prinsipe fan Oanbidding. Sa't artikulearre yn de Westminster Belidenis fan Leauwe (21.1): "De akseptabele wize fan it oanbidden fan de wiere God is ynsteld troch Himsels en sa beheind troch Syn eigen iepenbiere wil, dat Er net oanbidden wurde mei neffens de ynbyldings en apparaten fan minsken, of de suggestjes fan Satan, ûnder ienige sichtbere fertsjintwurdiging, of ienige oare wize net foarskreaun yn de Hillige Skrift."

Michael Farley, yn syn stúdzje "What is 'Biblical' Worship?" (*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 2008), beärgumintearret dat de hiele kanon fan de Skrift—sawol Ald as Nij Testamint—it regulearje moat wat tastien is yn oanbidding. Matt Merker, yn *Corporate Worship* (Crossway, 2021), definiearret it prinsipe bûnich: "God, troch Syn Wurd, bestjoert wat de lokale tsjerke dwaan moat as se gearkomt." It Regulatyf Prinsipe stiet as in bolwurk tsjin de soarte fan pragmatyske, merk-oandreaune oanpak fan oanbidding dy't de Tsjerkegroei- en Sikersgefoelich-bewegingen karakterisearre hat.

改革宗傳統透過敬拜規範原則，提供了最嚴謹之神學框架以評估敬拜實踐。如西敏信仰告白（21.1）所闡述：「敬拜真神之可接受方式，乃由祂自己設立，並受限於祂已啟示之旨意，以致祂不可按照人的想像與設計，或撒但的建議，以任何有形之表象，或聖經中未規定之任何其他方式被敬拜。」

邁克爾·法利（Michael Farley）於其研究〈何謂「合乎聖經的」敬拜？聖經詮釋學與福音派敬拜神學〉（《福音派神學學會期刊》，2008年）中主張，整部聖經正典——舊約與新約——必須規範敬拜中所許可之事。馬特·默克（Matt Merker）於《團體敬拜：教會如何作為上帝的子

民聚集》(Crossway出版社，2021年)中簡潔定義此原則：「上帝透過祂的話語，治理地方教會聚集時當行之事。」規範原則作為屏障，抵禦那種務實的、市場驅動的敬拜方式——此方式正是教會增長運動與慕道友導向運動之特徵——如萊斯特·路得與林瑞宏於《當代讚美與敬拜史》(Baker Academic出版社，2021年)所記錄，此等運動明確以文化適應與人數增長優先於聖經忠誠。

VI. Theological Synthesis: Why These Practices Constitute Blasphemy / Teologyske Synteze: Wêrom Dizze Praktiken Godslasterjen Foarmje / 神學綜合：為何此等實踐構成褻瀆

Having established the biblical definition of blasphemy, the historical witness of the early Church against pagan musical syncretism, and the anthropocentric distortion of modern worship lyrics, we may now synthesize these strands into a coherent theological judgment.

Blasphemy, as Scripture defines it, is any act, word, or attitude that profanes, degrades, or misrepresents the character of God, or that redirects worship away from God toward that which is not God. Three forms of blasphemy are identifiable in contemporary Protestant worship music.

First, the blasphemy of syncretism. By adopting musical forms rooted in pagan, New Age, and secular traditions, and overlaying them with Christian-sounding lyrics, contemporary Protestant worship commits the sin of Deuteronomy 12:30–31—worshipping God in the manner of the pagans. The golden calf narrative of Exodus 32 demonstrates that sincere intention and the use of God's name do not sanctify pagan forms of worship. As Ezekiel 22:26 declares: *"Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the*

holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean." The failure to distinguish between holy and profane in worship music is itself a violation of divine law.

Second, the blasphemy of idolatry. By centering worship lyrics on the self—on "me," "my feelings," "my experience," "my personal relationship"—to the exclusion of God's transcendence, sovereignty, holiness, and universal grace, the CPW movement has effectively made an idol of the worshipper's self. This violates the First Commandment (*"Thou shalt have no other gods before me,"* Exodus 20:3) and the prohibition of Exodus 20:4–5 against making graven images—for the self, elevated to the center of worship, becomes the graven image before which the worshipper bows.

Third, the blasphemy of trivialization. By reducing the infinite, holy, sovereign God of Scripture to a therapeutic companion whose primary function is to make the worshipper "feel good," contemporary worship music violates the Third Commandment by taking God's name in vain—emptying it of its proper weight, seriousness, and glory. As Isaiah 6:3 records the seraphim crying *"Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory,"* we must ask: does the music we sing in our churches reflect the terrifying holiness of God, or does it reduce Him to a cosmic boyfriend who exists to meet our emotional needs?

Nei it fêststellen fan de bibelske definysje fan godslasterjen, it histoarysk tsjûgenis fan de earste Tsjerke tsjin heidenske muzyksinkretisme, en de antroposintryske ferwringing fan moderne oanbiddingsteksten, kinne wy no dizze triedden synthesearje ta in gearhingjend teologysk oardiel.

Godslasterjen, sa't de Skrift it definiearret, is eltse died, wurd, of hâlding dy't it karakter fan God ûnthilliget, degradearret, of ferkeard foarstelt, of dy't oanbidding fan God wei

omliede nei dat wat net God is. Trije foarmen fan godslasterjen binne identifisearber yn hjoeddeiske Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk.

Earstens, de godslasterjen fan synkretisme. Troch it oernimmen fan muzykfoarmen woartele yn heidenske, New Age, en sekuliere tradysjes, en it oerlizzen dêrfan mei kristlik-klinkende teksten, begiet hjoeddeiske Protestantske oanbidding de sûnde fan Deuteronomium 12:30–31. De ferhaal fan it gouden keal yn Exodus 32 toant oan dat oprjochte bedoeling en it gebrûk fan Gods namme heidenske foarmen fan oanbidding net hilligje.

Twaddens, de godslasterjen fan ôfgoaderij. Troch oanbiddingsteksten te sintrearjen op it sels—op "my," "myn gefoelens," "myn ûnderfining"—mei útsluting fan Gods transendinsje, soevereiniteit, hillichheid, en universele genede, hat de HLO-beweging effektyf in ôfgod makke fan it sels fan de oanbidder. Dit skendt it Earste Gebod (*"Jo sille gjin oare goaden foar My hawwe,"* Exodus 20:3).

Treddens, de godslasterjen fan banalisearring (*godferlytsing*). Troch de ûneinige, hillige, soevereine God fan de Skrift te redusearjen ta in terapeutyske begelieder waans primêre funksje is om de oanbidder "goed fiele" te litten, skendt hjoeddeiske oanbiddingsmuzyk it Tredde Gebod troch Gods namme ydel te brûken—it leech meitsjen fan syn juste gewicht, earnst, en eare.

在確立了褻瀆之聖經定義、初代教會反對異教音樂融合主義之歷史見證，以及現代敬拜歌詞之以人為中心的扭曲之後，我們現在可以將此等線索綜合為一個連貫之神學判斷。

褻瀆，依聖經之定義，乃是任何褻瀆、貶損或曲解上帝性情之行為、言語或態度，或將敬拜從上帝轉向非上帝之事物。在當代新教敬拜音樂中可辨識出三種形式之褻瀆。

其一，融合主義之褻瀆。採用根植於異教、新紀元及世俗傳統之音樂形式，並以聽似基督教之歌詞覆蓋之，當代新教敬拜犯了申命記十二章三十至三十一節之罪——以異教之方式敬拜上帝。出埃及記三十二章之金牛犢敘事表明，真誠之意圖與上帝之名的使用並不能

使異教敬拜形式成聖。如以西結書二十二章二十六節所宣告：*「其中的祭司強解我的律法，褻瀆我的聖物，不分別聖的和俗的，也不使人分辨潔淨的和不潔淨的。」*未能在敬拜音樂中區分聖與俗，其本身即為對神聖律法之違犯。

其二，偶像崇拜之褻瀆。將敬拜歌詞聚焦於自我——「我」、「我的感受」、「我的經歷」、「我的個人關係」——而排除上帝之超越性、主權、聖潔及普世恩典，讚美敬拜運動已有效地將敬拜者之自我製成偶像。此違反了第一誡（「除了我以外，你不可有別的神」，出埃及記二十章三節）及出埃及記二十章四至五節禁止製造偶像之命令——因被提升至敬拜中心之自我，即成為敬拜者在其前俯伏之偶像。

**其三，輕忽化之褻瀆。*將聖經中無限、聖潔、至高之上帝降格為一位治療性同伴——其主要功能為使敬拜者「感覺良好」——當代敬拜音樂違反了第三誡，妄稱上帝之名——掏空其應有之份量、莊嚴與榮耀。當以賽亞書六章三節記載撒拉弗呼喊「聖哉！聖哉！聖哉！萬軍之耶和華；他的榮光充滿全地！」*之時，我們必須自問：我們在教會中所唱的音樂，是否反映了上帝令人敬畏之聖潔，抑或將祂降格為一位存在僅為滿足我們情感需求之宇宙伴侶？

VII. Conclusion / Konklúzje / 結論

The crisis of Protestant worship music is not a matter of taste—it is a matter of theology, and ultimately, of blasphemy. When the Church adopts the musical forms of pagan and New Age traditions and dresses them in Christian language, it commits the sin of syncretism condemned throughout the Old Testament. When it centers its worship on the emotional experiences and personal needs of the individual worshipper rather than on the transcendent glory of God, it commits the sin of idolatry. When it reduces the infinite God to a therapeutic accessory, it commits the sin of taking His name in vain.

The remedy is not nostalgia for a lost golden age of hymnody, but a return to the scriptural foundations of worship: worship that is theocentric, not anthropocentric; worship that is regulated by Scripture, not by market research; worship that glorifies

God, not the self; and worship whose musical forms are consonant with the holiness and transcendence of the God being worshipped. As the Retuned Hymn Movement and the modern hymn writers such as Keith and Kristyn Getty, Matt Boswell, Matt Papa, and CityAlight have demonstrated, it is entirely possible to produce worship music that is musically contemporary yet theologically robust—music that confesses human sinfulness, proclaims substitutionary atonement, celebrates God's sovereignty, and directs the gaze of the worshipper upward and outward rather than inward.

Let the Church heed the words of Amos 5:23–24: *"Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."* God is not impressed by our music. He demands righteousness. And righteous worship begins with putting God—not the self—at the center of our song.

De krisis fan Protestantske oanbiddingsmuzyk is gjin kwestje fan smaak—it is in kwestje fan teology, en úteinlik, fan godslasterjen. As de Tsjerke de muzykfoarmen fan heidenske en New Age-tradysjes oernimt en se yn kristlike taal klaaie lit, begiet se de sûnde fan synkretisme feroardiele troch it hiele Alde Testamint. As se har oanbidding sintrearret op de emoasjonele ûnderfinings en persoanlike behoeften fan de yndividuele oanbidder ynstee fan op de transendinte eare fan God, begiet se de sûnde fan ôfgoaderij. As se de ûneinige God redusearret ta in terapeutysk oanhingsel, begiet se de sûnde fan it ydel brûken fan Syn namme.

It remeedzje is gjin nostalgy foar in ferlern gouden tiidrek fan hymnody, mar in weromkear nei de skriftlike fûneminten fan oanbidding: oanbidding dy't teosentrysk is, net antroposentrysk; oanbidding dy't regulearre wurdt troch de Skrift, net troch merkûndersyk; oanbidding dy't God ferhearliket, net it sels; en oanbidding waans muzykfoarmen yn oerienstimming binne mei de hillichheid en transendinsje fan de God dy't oanbidden wurdt. Sa't de Retuned Hymn Movement en de moderne hymnskriuwers

lykas Keith en Kristyn Getty, Matt Boswell, Matt Papa, en CityAlight oantoand hawwe, is it folslein mooglik om oanbiddingsmuzyk te produsearjen dy't muzykaal hjoeddeisk en dochs teologysk robúst is.

Lit de Tsjerke de wurden fan Amos 5:23–24 yn acht nimme: *"Nim fan My it lûd fan jo lieten fuort; want Ik sil de melody fan jo fielen net hearre. Mar lit rjochtfeardigens streame as wetters, en gerjochtichheid as in machtige stream."* God is net ûnder de yndruk fan ús muzyk. Hy easket rjochtfeardigens. En rjochtfeardige oanbidding begjint mei it pleatsen fan God—net it sels—yn it sintrum fan ús liet.

Soli Deo Gloria.

新教敬拜音樂之危機非品味之問題——而是神學之問題，終極而言，乃褻瀆之問題。當教會採用異教與新紀元傳統之音樂形式並以基督教語言裝飾之，便犯了遍及舊約所譴責之融合主義之罪。當教會將其敬拜聚焦於個別敬拜者之情緒經驗與個人需求，而非上帝之超越榮耀，便犯了偶像崇拜之罪。當教會將無限之上帝降格為治療性附屬物，便犯了妄稱其名之罪。

補救之道非對失落之聖詩黃金時代之懷舊，而是回歸敬拜之聖經基礎：以神為中心而非以人為中心之敬拜；由聖經而非市場調查所規範之敬拜；榮耀上帝而非自我之敬拜；以及其音樂形式與所敬拜之上帝的聖潔與超越性相稱之敬拜。正如重調聖詩運動及現代聖詩作者如基夫婦（Keith and Kristyn Getty）、馬特·博斯維爾（Matt Boswell）、馬特·帕帕（Matt Papa）及CityAlight所展示，完全可能創作出音樂上具當代性而神學上堅實之敬拜音樂——承認人之罪性、宣揚代贖之救贖、頌讚上帝之主權，並引導敬拜者之目光向上、向外，而非向內。

願教會留意阿摩司書五章二十三至二十四節之話語：*「你們向我獻的歌聲，我不要聽，你們的琴聲，我也不肯聽。惟願公平如大水滾滾，使公義如江河滔滔！」*上帝不為我們的音樂所動。祂所要的是公義。而公義之敬拜，始於將上帝——而非自我——置於我們歌唱之中心。

惟獨榮耀歸於上帝。（*Soli Deo Gloria.*）

Bibliography / Boarnelist / 參考書目

Primary Scriptural References / Primêre Skriftferwizings / 主要經文引用: Exodus 20:3–7; 32:4–5 / Leviticus 24:15–16 / Deuteronomy 12:29–31 / Psalm 96:1–3 / Isaiah 6:3; 42:8 / Ezekiel 22:26 / Amos 5:23–24 / John 3:16; 4:23–24 / Romans 1:21–25 / 2 Corinthians 6:14–17 / Colossians 3:16 / Revelation 7:9.

Scholarly and Theological Sources / Wittenskiplike en Teologyske Boarnen / 學術與神學文獻:

Brace, Shawn. "Why I've Been Struggling With Contemporary Worship Music Lately." *Substack*, 2025.

Carter, Paul. "Why I Abandoned Seeker Church." *The Gospel Coalition Canada*, August 23, 2018.

Clement of Alexandria. *Paedagogus*, c. 200 AD.

Dawn, Marva J. *Reaching Out Without Dumbing Down: A Theology of Worship for This Urgent Time*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Farley, Michael. "What is 'Biblical' Worship? Biblical Hermeneutics and Evangelical Theologies of Worship." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51, no. 3 (2008): 591–613.

Frame, John M. *Contemporary Worship Music: A Biblical Defense*. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 1997.

Gibson, Jonathan, and Mark Earngey, eds. *Reformation Worship: Liturgies from the Past for the Present*. Greensboro: New Growth Press, 2018.

Gordon, T. David. *Why Johnny Can't Sing Hymns: How Pop Culture Rewrote the Hymnal*. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2010.

Grout, Donald Jay. *A History of Western Music*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1960.

Leaver, Robin A. *Luther's Liturgical Music: Principles and Implications*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Lucarini, Dan. *Why I Left the Contemporary Christian Music Movement: Confessions of a Former Worship Leader*. Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2002.

McKinley, Braden J. "The Neglect of Confession in Contemporary Worship Music." *Artistic Theologian* (2024): 43–64.

McKinnon, James. *Music in Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Merker, Matt. *Corporate Worship: How the Church Gathers as God's People*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2021.

Morgenthaler, Sally. *Worship Evangelism: Inviting Unbelievers into the Presence of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999.

Myers, Ken. *All God's Children and Blue Suede Shoes: Christians and Popular Culture*. Wheaton: Crossway, 1989.

Perez, Adam A., and Luke Litz. "Towards a Reformed Perspective on Contemporary Praise and Worship Music." *Reformed Journal* (2023).

Reagan, Wen. "A Beautiful Noise: A History of Contemporary Worship Music in Modern America." PhD diss., Duke University, 2015.

Relevant Magazine. "Enough With Me-Centered Worship Music." n.d.

Ruth, Lester, and Lim Swee Hong. *A History of Contemporary Praise & Worship: Understanding the Ideas That Reshaped the Protestant Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2021.

Benedict, Bruce, and Lester Ruth. "Retuned Hymn Movement." In *Hymns and Hymnody: Historical and Theological Introductions*, Volume 3, 301–314. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2019.

Scheer, Greg. "Contemporary Praise and Worship Music." In *Hymns and Hymnody III: Historical and Theological Introductions, Volume 3*. Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2019.

Scheer, Greg. "Retune My Heart to Sing Thy Grace: How Old Hymn Texts Found a New Home among Evangelicals." *The Hymn* 65, no. 4 (2014).

Sproul, R.C. *The Holiness of God*. Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1985.

Tertullian. *De Spectaculis*, c. 200 AD.

Tozer, A.W. *Worship: The Missing Jewel of the Evangelical Church*. Camp Hill: Christian Publications, n.d.

Veith, Gene Edward. "Church Music and Contemporary Culture." *Modern Reformation*.

Veith, Gene Edward, and Thomas Wilmeth. *Honky-Tonk Gospel: The Story of Sin and Salvation in Country Music*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2001.

Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), Chapter 21.

Westminster Shorter Catechism (1647), Question 1.

Frysk Neologisms Created / Fryske Neologismen Skeppen / 本文所創之弗里斯語新詞

Throughout this essay, several neologisms were created for West Frisian to accommodate theological and musicological concepts not present in standard Frysk vocabulary:

- **Selsoanbidding** (self-worship): *sels* (self) + *oanbidding* (worship). Used to describe the narcissistic orientation of worship toward the self.
- **Selsfergoading** (self-deification): *sels* (self) + *fergoading* (deification, from *god* "god"). Describes the elevation of the self to divine status in worship.
- **Autolâtrije** (autolatry): Borrowed from Greek *αὐτολατρεία*, adapted to Frysk phonology. The worship of the self.
- **Grondfêstings** (foundations, in a structural-musical sense): *grûn* (ground) + *fêstings* (fixings, foundations). Used for the structural underpinnings of musical composition.
- **Sfearmuzykskippen** (ambient soundscapes): *sfear* (atmosphere) + *muzyk* (music) + *skippen* (creations). Neologism for the ambient soundscapes characteristic of New Age music.
- **Godferlytsing** (trivialization of God): *God* + *ferlytsing* (diminishment, belittlement). The act of making God small or trivial.
- **Felle-ienstimmichheid** (vehement unanimity): *felle* (fierce) + *ienstimmichheid* (unanimity). Used to translate McKinnon's description of patristic opposition to pagan music.
- **Kontemporaneïteit** (contemporaneity): Adapted from the Latin/English *contemporaneity* to Frysk orthographic conventions.
- **Ôfdommen** (dumbing down): *ôf-* (prefix, down/off) + *dommen* (to make dumb/stupid). Translates Dawn's concept of "dumbing down" worship.